



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION,

1877-8.

MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE AT THE TENTH ANNUAL SESSION.

N. L. Andrews, Madison University, Hamilton, N. Y.
H. C. G. Brandt, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
Charles J. Buckingham, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
Henry F. Burton, University of Rochester, Rochester, N. Y.
William C. Cattell, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.
B. L. Gildersleeve, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
W. W. Goodwin, Harvard College, Cambridge, Mass.
S. S. Haldeman (University of Penna.), Chickies, Pa.
Albert Harkness, Brown University, Providence, R. I.
Charles R. Hemphill, Theological Seminary, Columbia, S. C.
M. W. Humphreys, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.
A. C. Kendrick, University of Rochester, Rochester, N. Y.
F. A. March, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.
A. C. Merriam, Columbia College, New York City.
Edward North, Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y.
C. K. Nelson, St. John's College, Annapolis, Md.
J. Sachs, Classical School, 649 Madison Ave., New York City.
A. Duncan Savage, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
William C. Sawyer, Lawrence University, Appleton, Wis.
T. D. Seymour, Western Reserve College, Hudson, Ohio.
J. B. Sewall, Thayer Academy, Braintree, Mass.
L. A. Sherman, Hopkins Grammar School, New Haven, Conn.
W. A. Stevens, Rochester Theological Seminary, Rochester, N. Y.
C. H. Toy, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky.
J. Hammond Trumbull, Hartford, Conn.

AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION.

SARATOGA, N. Y., Tuesday, July 9, 1878.

The Tenth Annual Session was called to order at 7.30 o'clock P. M., in the audience room of the Opera House of the Grand Union Hotel, by the President, Professor B. L. Gildersleeve, of Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

The Secretary being absent, Professor W. A. Stevens, of Rochester Theological Seminary, Rochester, N. Y., was appointed Secretary of the meeting.

The Treasurer, Charles J. Buckingham, Esq., presented his report, showing the receipts and the expenditures of the past year. [See p. 31.]

On motion, President William C. Cattell and Professor M. W. Humphreys, were appointed Auditors of the Treasurer's report.

The Secretary presented a report from the Executive Committee, announcing the election to membership of,

Rev. T. T. Eaton, D.D., Petersburg, Va., and Mr. S. E. W. Becker, Wilmington, Del.

Professor C. H. Toy, of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky., read a paper on "The Yoruban Language."

The Yoruban language, spoken by a partially civilized people living near the western coast of Africa, east of Dahomey, belongs to an isolated linguistic group, which shows little or no resemblance to the great Hotentot and Bantu families in the south, or the Negro and Berber dialects on the north, but is nearly akin to the Grebo and other dialects of Liberia. The literature consists of collections of proverbs and Bible-translations made by Christian missionaries. Grammars have been written by Crowther (London, 1852) and Bowen (Smithsonian Institution, 1858).

I. Phonology. The phonetic system consists of letters and tones. The consonants are eighteen in number, namely: the aspiration *h*, of palatals the surd *k*, the sonant *g*, the nasal *ng*, the semi-vowel *y*, of linguo-dentals surd *t*, sonant *d*, nasal *n*, semi-vowels *r*, *l*, and the compound linguo-sibilant *j* (*dʒ*), of labials surd *p* (only in the combination *kp*), sonant *b*, spirant *f*, nasal *m*, semi-vowel *w*, of sibilants *s* and *ʃ* (*sh*), to which might be added *z* (*zh*) in *dʒ = j*. There are no gutturals. The combinations *dʒ* (*j*), *kp*, *gb* and *mb* occur frequently; of these the first may be a weakening of *g* or *d*, *mb* (only in *mbe* and *mbi*) probably comes from word-composition, and

the origin of the others is doubtful. The vowels are the three primitive *a, i, u*, the secondary *e, e* (as in *let*), *o, o* (as in *not*), and the diphthongs *ai, ei, oi, oi, oi*, and apparently *au* (in a few words, mostly adverbs and probably compounds). There is a law of vocalic harmony (partially prevalent) by which vowels of personal pronouns and prefixes are made to accord with those of verbs and roots. In its law of tone, whereby words spelled alike are distinguished in meaning, the Yoruban stands to some extent on the same plane with the Chinese.

II. Morphology. 1. Roots and Words. The roots are probably all monosyllabic, most polysyllabic forms easily resolving themselves into simpler elements. The word is not differentiated in form from the root, and there is no essential difference in form between Noun and Verb, tho a partial difference is made by the system of nominal prefixes; thus, there is not a verb of less than three syllables (that is, not compound) beginning with *e* in the language, *e* being a noun-prefix. Roots consist of a single vowel, or consonant and vowel (with or without nasal appendage); a few words beginning with two consonants are probably compounds. 2. Word-composition. Composite noun-forms are made by derivation, by reduplication, and by composition proper. The derivation is by prefixes only (*a, e, e, i, o, o, abi, ati*, etc.), and the language is rich in these forms, as *oku* "corpse" from *ku* "to die," *atilo* "a going" from *lo* "to go," *ese* "sin," *lese* "to have sin," *elése* "sinner," *ilese* "the state of having sin," *ailése* "sinless," and several others from *se* "to sin." These prefixes were probably originally independent words, and the derivation is true composition. There are compound verbs, made up of verb and verb, or verb and preposition. 3. Inflection. The Yoruban may be called semi-inflecting, there being a number of agglutinations that have more or less lost their independent character. (1) Nouns are without inflectional marks of gender, number, or case. Gender is sometimes denoted by prefixed sex-words (as in English), as *ako*, "male," *abo* "female" (from *bi* "to beget"); thus: *akomalu* "bull," *abomalu* "cow." Case-distinction is marked by position (as in Hebrew), or by the Relative Pronoun *ti*, equivalent to "of" (as in Aramaic). The comparative and superlative degrees of Adjectives are made by the affixes *ju* and *julo* respectively (= "beyond, more"). (2) Verbs show no distinction of gender, number, or person, nor in themselves of time, completeness or modal conception, and there are no derived stems (Causals, etc.), as in Hottentot, Bantu, Woloff. But temporal and modal distinctions are expressed by prefixed verbal or pronominal words, continuous action by *n* (probably the substantive Verb *ni*) and sometimes by *ma* (perhaps = "do"—so in Basa and Grebo), past time and completeness by *ti*, future time by *o* or *yio* (the origin of the *yi* is doubtful; it may be the pronoun *yi* = "this," or a verb = "turn, revolve," as Basa *dyi*, Grebo *di* "come," *mi* "go," *yi* "purpose"). In the expression of modal conceptions the Yoruban stands about on the same plane with modern English—certain agglutinations have acquired modal significations: *ba* is employed in the protasis of conditional sentences involving uncertainty, and it has such agglutinations expressing obligation, desire, permission, ability, and the like (as English shall, must, will, may, can).

Participles are made by prefixing *n* to the root, or by abstract substantives (as English "I go a-fishing"); a Passive is formed by the indefinite construction with Pronoun *a* or *nwon* "they," as *afo o* "they broke it" = "it was broken," or by the use of the substantive verb *ni* with a reduplicated noun, as *riri* (from *ri* "to see") *ni baba* "father is 'seen.'" The language shows a primitive exuberance of substantive verbs, which, however, are distinguished in use. The simplest form is *ni* (before vowels *li*), perhaps connected with *ni* "to have," and frequently employed in a merely emphatic way; *mbe* (from *bi* "beget") and *wa* make prominent the idea of existence; *ri*, *se*, *ya* express modal being; there are others less definite. (3) The pronouns are without the rich generic development of the Hottentot, and are in other respects flexionless. Personal: Singular, *emi* (*mo*, *mo*, *ng*), *ivo* (*o*, *o*), *on* (*o*, *o*), Plural *awa*, *enyin*, *awon* (*nwon*), with the objective forms *mi*, *o*, *a* (*e*, *e*, *i*, *o*, *o*, *u*), *wa*, *nyin*, *won*. Besides the law of vowel-harmony above-mentioned, there is this difference in the forms of the first person singular, that *ng* is used only with future verbs. Emphatic forms are made by adding *na*, and reflexives by prefixing *ka* and *ara*. Demonstrative: *na*, *ni* (*wonni*), *yi* (*eyi*, *eyi*). Interrogative: *ta*, *ti*, *ni*, *ki*, *wo*. Relative: *ti*. The preponderance of the simple dental, palatal, and labial forms (found in most languages) is obvious, and the original identity of all the pronominal forms may be regarded as probable, but nothing further as to their origin can be said. Their particular uses must here be passed over.

III. Syntax. The syntax is very simple. The usual order of words in the simple sentence is: subject, copula, predicate; the attributive adjective (or pronoun) usually follows its substantive; the substantive verb as mere copula is generally omitted. The order in relative clauses is the same. Relational particles are few; various parts of a composite sentence are commonly regarded merely in the relation of temporal sequence, as in Hebrew, whereby a naïve and vivid coloring is given to narrative and proverb. Purpose is expressed by an abstract noun alone, when the subjects of the principal and dependent verbs are the same; when they are different, the dependent clause is introduced by *ki*. Conditional protasis is introduced by *bi* (= "if"), or by *iba* (= "obligation") followed by *jepé* or *sepe*, as *iba*, *jepé* (or, *sepe*) *emi ni*, "had it been I," literally: "obligation that it is that I am." Substantive clauses, as subject or object, are introduced by *ti* (probably the Relative Pronoun).

Remarks were made upon this paper by Professor S. S. Halde-
man, of the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Professor F. A. March, of Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.,
Chairman of the Committee, appointed in 1875, "to take into
consideration the whole matter of the Reform of English Spelling,"
and continued after its Reports in 1876 and 1877 [see Proceedings,
1875, pp. 8, 13, 23; 1876, pp. 35, 36; 1877, pp. 30, 31], presented
the Report of the Committee, as follows:

In accordance with the plan of preparing a list of words for which an
amended spelling may be adopted concurrent with that now in use, as

suggested by President J. Hammond Trumbull, at the session of 1875, and favorably reported upon by the committee of that session, the committee now present the following words as the beginning of such list, and recommend them for immediate use:

Ar.	Giv.	Tho.
Catalog.	Hav.	Thru.
Definit.	Infinít.	Wisht.
Gard.	Liv.	

On motion, it was

Resolved, That the Report of the Committee on the Reform of English Spelling be accepted, and the Committee be continued for one year.

Professor S. S. Haldeman, of the University of Pennsylvania, then read a paper "On Virgil's Hexameters."

This paper presents a discussion of the principles of the Hexameter, illustrated by an English version of a hundred lines from the opening of the *Æneid*, in which an attempt is made to present every syllable and every natural or prose accent of the original, presenting a specimen sufficiently long to familiarize the listener to the nature of the versification, if he is not so much accustomed to the powerful accent of German or English as to prevent him from appreciating the lighter effect of a rhythm of quantity, which seems proper only in languages where the accents are light. Even if the classic accent was, as some believe, a change of pitch rather than of force, the stress which the derived languages exhibit at the points of accent, indicate at least a concomitant stress originally.

The pronunciation of words is essentially the same in prose and verse, and there is sufficient evidence (Quintilian, Priskian, Donatus) that Latin differed from Greek in being without final accent, so that *CAN'o* could not be pronounced *CANO'* in the first line of Virgil. But while the quantitative nature of classic rhythm is admitted, the average speaker with an English vernacular knows so little about quantity, that he will assert that in the pairs *fate fat*, *deep dip*, *note not*, three are long and three short, where all require the same time, and knowing no rhythm but that of stress, the character of his own emphasized verse is intentionally or unconsciously forced upon classic examples, and there are Latin-English grammars in which the beginning of every foot is marked with an accentual, instead of confining it to the last two, which enable the listener to determine the metre.

The most prominent feature of the hexameter line is the two closing feet of a dactyl and spondee differing from the preceding feet in having their natural accent at the beginning. In the first half of the line, the accents may occur at any point in the foot, or a single foot may have two natural accents, and to connect these with the two final feet (the adonic close), Virgil endeavors to interpose a fourth neutral foot which shall be without natural accent, as in bk. 1, l. 8—

Mū'sā mī'|hī cāvs'|ās mēm'ō||rā qvō || nū'mīnē | lē'so |

where the fourth foot is neutral.

In efforts to bring Latin and English prosody into correspondence, and to get rid of the definite statements of the ancient grammarians, Professor Key says they "were dealing with a language which was already dead;" and Richard Roe asserts of the ancients that "there is reason to believe that their perceptions of quantity were confused and imperfect" !

A few lines would enable a Greek or Roman listener to detect hexameter verse, a test which fails, not only with the spurious English caricatures, but with the ordinary English heroic measure, where, in many cases, the supposed five-foot line is equally of four or of six feet, and when rhyme is rejected, the close of the lines must be indicated by non-metric methods, such as punctuation and syntax. Take, for example, the opening of "Paradise Lost," when it will be found that the first line may be broken at several points without injury to the rhythm, which is rather that of rhythmic prose than of a given metre—

Of Mans

First disobedience, and the fruit of that
Forbidden tree, whose mortal tast brought death
Into the world, and all our woe, with loss

And the fruit of that forbidden tree, whose
Mortal tast brought death into the world, and
All our woe, with loss of Eden, till one

Whose mortal tast brought death into the world
And all our woe, with loss of Eden till
One greater man restore us, and regain

Mans first disobedience, and the fruit of
That forbidden tree, whose mortal tast brought
Death into the world, and all our woe, with

Mans first disobedience and the
Fruit of that forbidden tree, whose
Mortal tast brought death into the

—which resembles a line of "Evangeline" (2:249)—

Louis|burg is | not for|gotten, |
nor Beau | Sé|jour, | nor Port | Royal. |

Ovid's line (Metam. bk. 6, l. 451)—

ecce venit magno dives philomela paratu;

may be thus imitated in English—

she is *com*|ing, *cloth'd* | with *pru*|dence, Philo|mela the | *care*worn | —

but this will be likely to strike the English ear as *seven* accentual feet—

she is | *com*ing, | *cloth'd* with | *pru*dence, | Philo|mela the | *care*worn. |

The following lines (87-91) are selected from the paper—

Then follow men's loud cries, an' echoes are heard from the cordage.
Clouds quickly bēdim' the expanse from all eyes of the Teuceri,
and Nōx fuliginose incubates—broods on the high sea.
Poles of the orb have thunderd, and air carries numerous lightnings;
all things threaten instant and widespread death unto mankind.

The author gave a version of 33 lines (1-33) in the "Literary World," New York, Nov. 6, 1852; of four lines in his "Analytic Orthography," 1860, § 646; and of fourteen lines in the article HEXAMETER of "Johnson's Cyclopædia" New York, 1876.

The Association thereupon adjourned to 9 o'clock Wednesday morning.

WEDNESDAY, July 10—MORNING SESSION.

The Association resumed its session at 9 o'clock A. M., the President in the chair.

The minutes of the previous session were read and approved.

The Secretary presented a report from the Executive Committee, announcing the election to membership of,

Professor Henry F. Burton, University of Rochester, Rochester, N. Y.

On motion, it was

Resolved, That the Association approve of the list of words reported by the Committee on the Reform of English Spelling, as judiciously selected for the purpose mentioned in the Report.

On motion, it was

Resolved, That a committee be appointed by the Chair to recommend a suitable time and place for the next meeting.

The President appointed as such committee, President William C. Cattell, Professor W. W. Goodwin, and Professor C. H. Toy.

On motion, it was

Resolved, That a committee be appointed by the Chair to nominate officers for the next year.

The President appointed as such committee, Professor A. Harkness, Professor S. S. Haldeman, and Dr. J. H. Trumbull.

Professor H. C. G. Brandt, of Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md., then read a paper on "The Roman Alphabet in German."*

There is a strong movement in Germany for the establishing of the roman alphabet. The Berlin conference, on orthography, of 1876, did not do its duty towards it. The question comes home to us in this country with our german-english schools, on account of the extensive study of

* Printed according to the five following rules of the Spelling Reform Association. The capitals of proper adjectives are dropped:

1.—Omit *a* from the digraph *ea* when pronounced as *e*-short, as in *hed*, *helth*, etc. 2.—Omit silent *e* after a short vowel, as in *hav*, *giv*, etc. 3.—Write *f* for *ph* in such words as *alfabet*, *fantom*, etc. 4.—When a word ends with a double letter, omit the last, as in *shal*, *clif*, *eg*, etc. 5.—Change *ed* final to *t* where it has the sound of *t*, as in *lasht*, *imprest*, etc.

german, and our intimate relation with german scholars and german learning. The movement gains not small momentum from the objection of foreigners to the old german type. It goes hand in hand with german spelling reform. While we in this country cannot move faster in regard to the latter than the fatherland and certainly not so far as radical fonetic spellers, we ought to do all in our power to help on the former.

We must insist upon it that the use of the roman alphabet is a re-introduction of it, not an innovation. The so-called gothic character is the misshapen roman character. It became angular in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, partly through the influence of gothic architecture with its straight lines and pointed arches. Unfortunately printing was invented when this changed form was the prevalent one and the type was shaped after it. The first books in Germany, Italy, Holland, Spain, and England were printed in it. In Italy, first of all, it was dropped and the pure roman character resorted to, owing largely to the round writing of the classical manuscripts.

In the sixteenth century, the latin classics were printed in latin type in every country that could boast scholars. Popular books like the bible were printed in gothic; in Italy not even these, in France to a small extent. The Dutch and English dropped it entirely in the seventeenth century. Germany, Denmark, Sweden, and Bohemia still retain the gothic type or german, as it is deservedly and fondly called.

Originally it was no more german than it was dutch or english or italian. It is german now, because Germany is the only nation of the first rank that still clings patriotically, as she thinks, to an old abuse.

For international reasons, Germany should establish the roman alphabet. It is the only international alphabet in the world. German scholars, of whatever branch of learning, print their publications—at least ninety out of a hundred—in latin type. And why? Because the results of german scholarship are read the world over and latin type makes them more accessible and palatable to foreigners.

There are certain drawbacks which hamper the rapid strides of this movement. The german books in latin type are not printed alike. There is great irregularity in the use of the capitals, and there are five different signs for german *sz* (β).

As to capitals, some leave them, as in german type, to every noun. Some reject them entirely except in the word beginning a paragraph, and some reject them in all nouns except proper names.

To bring about uniformity, the following “rules” are proposed, which also include a few changes in spelling, generally approved of:

1. Drop the capitals of nouns, excepting proper names.*

The french system is preferable to the english. Hence, do not use capitals for adjectives derived from names of persons, places, and countries, for the names of the months, the days of the week, the points of the compass.

- e. g. preussischer grenadier, holländische heringe, ostfriesische butter, bairisch bier.

*To give capitals to the personal and possessive pronouns in address and letters is a matter of etiquette.

“Der erste tag im monat mai
Ist mir der glücklichste von allen.”

Hagedorn.

“Am sonntag bet’ und sing, am werkttag schaff’ dein sach.”

2. Write s for j and ſ; ss for ff, jſ, ſſ.

e. g. “Mit musse kommt man auch fern.”
“Er muss das mus essen.”
“Grosse kinder, grosse sorgen.”
“Mass ist zu allen dingen gut.”
“Mässig wird alt, zuviel stirbt bald.”

Ther being now no consistency in the use of jſ, ſſ, fs, ſ, Ɔ, Ɓ, nothing would be gained by retaining the awkward sz. The signs fs Ɔ, Ɓ, used to som extent in german books in roman type, should be discarded, as other nations do not use them. They ar only so many more signs for the same sound—voiceless s—for which ther ar two alreedy, ss and s final. If it wer the office of the consonant to indicate the quantity of the preceding vowel, one of the abov signs might be used after a long vowel and ss after a short one, as the Berlin conference proposed. The diacritical mark [-] over the vowel would indicate that much better.

3. Drop d in the adjectiv *todt* and all its derivativs. Hence, *tot*, *töten*, *der tote*, *totschlagen*. But *der tod*, *todkrank*, *todfeind*, *todfehde*, *todsünde*.

Erndte and *gescheide* occur only rarely now for *ernte* and *gescheid*.

4. Drop h after t,—e. g. *Thurm*, *turm*; *Heirath*, *heirat*; *Räthsel*, *rätsel*; suffix *thum*, *tum*, as *königtum*, *reichtum*.

Retain h, however, in borrowed words, e. g. *kathedrale*, *katheder*, *athlet*.

e. g. “Doch bin ich auch nicht der, der alles, was
Er tat, als wohlgetan verteid’gen möchte.”

5. Write a singl consonant in the affixes *-niß* or *nijß*, *-inn*, *niß-* or *nijß-*, e. g. *Begräbniß*, *begräbnis*; *Miß-* or *Mißebranch*, *misbrauch*; *Königin*, *königin*. An added vowel restores the double consonant, e. g. *gefängnisse*, *freundinnen*, *missetat*.

The Berlin conference excepts *Miße-*, because it is a “stammsilbe.” But it is difficult to see, why *mis-* is not as truly an *ableitungssilbe* as *-nis*. Besides *-nijß* does not lose one s because it is a *derivativ syllabl*, but becaus s is superfluous.

6. In *drß* or *drjß*, *wrß* and their derivativs, in borrowed words ending in *ß*, or *jß* write only one s:—e. g. *des*, *wes*, *indes*, *deshalb*, *desfalls*, *weshalb*, *compas*, *atlas*, *firnis*, *kürbis*, *as*, *küras*. An added vowel restores the doubl consonant as in *5*:—e. g. *des compasses*, *atlasse*, *kürasse*, *dessen*, *wessen*.

7. When in compound words the same letter would occur three times, drop one,—e. g. *Bettuch*, *bettuch*, *Schiffahrt*, *schiffahrt*; *Stammutter*, *stammutter*.

8. Drop one l in *Wallſich*, *Wallnuß*, *Wallroß*, and write after the analogy of *himbeere*, *damhirsch*, etc., *walfish*, *walnuss*, *walross*.

9. Write the foreign infinitiv ending *-iren* uniformly *-iren*, e. g. *studiren*, *turniren*, *inquartiren*, *regiren*, *spaziren*, *barbiren*.

The Berlin conference wants to write still *regieren* and *spazieren*, because it is “*üblich*,” and *barbieren*, *turnieren*, because ther ar nouns, *barbier*, *turnier*. But why not write all alike *-iren*?

10. Words are divided into syllables, in general according to pronunciation, sometimes according to etymology, and if compound according to composition,—e. g. be-sänf-ti-gung, ü-ber-ein-stim-mung, wand-te, reis-ten, du ris-sest, un-gern, da-rin, ras-ten (raged), wes-pe, has-pel, hät-scheln, wach-sen, haus-tür, ret-ter, was-ser.

The consonant combinations ch, ck, ph, sch, st, tz, ar inseparabl—
e. g. ma-chen, we-cken, so-pha, wa-schen, ra-sten (rest), ka-tze, schwatz-te, wach-te.

As to rule 1, which concerns capitals only, it may be remarked that they were at first used only for the beginnings of paragraphs and pages. In the earliest printed books space was left for the capitals, which were added by the hand of the illuminator. When they came to be printed with the rest, they became very common, especially in Germany.

At first proper names received them, then appellatives, then neuter and abstract nouns. In the seventeenth century every noun, as is now the case. It is proposed to limit them to the word beginning a sentence and to proper names, because all nations, except the English, using the Roman alphabet, do so for the very good reason, probably, that a more extended use of them is of no advantage.

A few changes in spelling are added, because in the change of type they will find a more ready acceptance than in the old alphabet.

Remarks were made upon this paper by Dr. Julius Sachs, Professor S. S. Haldeman, Professor M. W. Humphreys, and Professor W. C. Sawyer.

Professor W. C. Sawyer, of Lawrence University, Appleton, Wisconsin, next read a paper on "Some Contributions of the Phonograph to Phonetic Science."

The Phonograph, though but an indistinct talker as yet, converts audible into visible form with such marvellous exactness that the latter can be reconverted into the former. This affords the basis of a new demonstration of the compound character of the *a* of *fate*. Long *a* distinctly and forcibly pronounced into the mouth-piece of the phonograph yields, besides the fine and confused indentations upon the tin-foil at the beginning and end of the utterance, two distinct series of uniform groups of indentations. The first is the series representing the principal element of the letter. It is composed of miniature human tracks, the hollow of the foot being quite plainly marked in every other one, and altogether wanting in those which are intermediate. These are followed by impressions which change gradually into uniform groups of three indentations each, of which the first is long and the second and third are round. The space between the long mark and the round ones is about twice as great as that between the round ones themselves. The length of the long impression is equal to about two-thirds of the space occupied by the two round dots together with the interval between them. In the tin-foil examined, the first series is about twice as long as the second, the groups

in each averaging about seven to the inch. It is evident that the phonograph cannot give the same result if the needle passes backward over the impressions described as when it passes forward. If we get the sound *ei* (Italian) when the needle passes one way, we ought, on *a priori* principles, to get *ie* when it passes in the opposite direction. So long as like causes produce like effects, a simple and uniform vowel sound cannot produce two such distinct series of impressions as I have described, nor can the phonograph produce a single uniform sound from two series of indentations that are so different one from the other.

With this invention we enter upon a new era in phonetic and orthoëpic science. A dull ear, even more than an unconquerable conservatism, holds the spelling reform in check. An exact symbol implies a definite conception of the thing symbolized, and, until scholars can agree concerning the elements of our speech, all systems of notation must remain crude and ill adapted to the purposes of culture. It is vain to shout, "A sign for a sound," till we discover for what precise sounds signs are required. The phonograph, however, comes to the aid of this reform at the point of its sorest need, and, as illustrated above, brings the eye to the help of the ear in so effective a manner as to promise the settlement of all, or nearly all, our phonetic disputes.

I venture here a query upon which I dare not yet express any opinion of my own: "May not the essential forms produced by the phonograph under the impulses of the voice in articulate utterances be advantageously substituted for our barbarous alphabet?"

Numerous unforeseen difficulties may arise, but those which now appear are not insuperable. We are told, for instance, that we cannot even read the writing of the phonograph, on account of the slightness and constancy of its variations. Its impressions and traces must resemble each other precisely as much as its utterances,—an invaluable correspondence—and when we enlarge the traces of the stylus upon a surface easy for the eye, we shall see that they differ as much in form as our vowels and consonants differ in sound. Variations which correspond to the peculiar overtones of individual voices may be neglected, since they are as unessential to distinctness of writing as the latter are to the distinctness of speech. It may be thought that the writing of the phonograph is too complicated and difficult of construction to be adaptable to general use for script and print. Against this objection two considerations tend to reassure us:

1. The *profile* of the depressions and elevations upon the foil is a continuous curve, easily traced, and probably contains everything essential to the writing.

2. A *brief section* of the curve corresponding to a single sound in the phonograph—for instance, the curve covering the two dots and dash composing one of the groups described above—would sufficiently define that sound.

I will allude to one more possible benefit that the phonograph may confer upon linguistic science. The pronunciation of foreign languages is wretchedly taught in the great majority of our schools, even of the highest grades. When the phonograph is brought to perfection, the

voices of the best orators and orthoëpists of all living languages may be heard in our class-rooms, and, if Mr. Edison himself has not over-estimated the possibilities of his invention, the children in our homes may, in their most susceptible years, have their very toys so selected that they shall acquire considerable familiarity with colloquial French or German, or both, in the time devoted to play.

The phonograph is still too immature, and my own study of its results quite too slight, to indicate the real value to philology of this invention; but I seem to see a clear promise that some of its best fruits will fall within our province.

Remarks were made upon this paper by Professor S. S. Haldeman.

A paper entitled "Observations on Plato's Cratylus" was then read by Dr. Julius Sachs, of New York City.

The Cratylus gives a resumé of the theories, prevalent in Plato's time, on the relations between thought and speech; to appreciate Plato's own views is rendered difficult both by his style and the meagre knowledge we possess of contemporaneous philosophical speculation, hence the divergent interpretation put upon the Cratylus by modern critics. Some salient points, however, susceptible of common acceptance, the works of two recent critics seem to contain, Benfey's "Über die Aufgabe des Platonischen Dialogs Kratylus," and Dr. Herman Schmidt's "Plato's Cratylus im Zusammenhange dargestellt." The vindication of Plato's authorship for the dialogue seems fully carried out by Benfey; discarding the traditional speculative fancies on the "underlying meaning" and connection of the various parts of the dialogue, as Steinthal, Steinhart, etc., have elaborated them, Benfey has evolved, with less brilliancy perhaps, but with more trustworthiness, the exact meaning of the technical terms used. A careful arrangement of the various grades of meaning that the word *ἐνθῆκη* shows throughout the dialogue, and in like manner a concise discrimination between Plato's use of the various verbs, indicating "*thought*," between the terms *νόημα* and *ῥῆμα* are among the merits of Benfey's work; the instincts of the student of Comparative Grammar have confirmed by many valuable suggestions the continuity of reasoning in the dialogue, notably so in 388, B., where the perception of the original root *da* in *διδάσκειν* affords the justification for the transition from *διακρίνειν* to *διδάσκειν*. Language, as it exists, cannot be correct either *φύσει* or *θέσει*; an ideal language only might be constructed conformably to these principles, and whatever correctness of appellation actual language shows forth, is purely accidental.

Dr. J. Hammond Trumbull, of Hartford, Conn., presented papers on "The Name Oregon," and on "The Inflections of the Micmac Verb."

The last paper of the morning session was read by Professor

M. W. Humphreys, of Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn., on "The Influence of Accent in Latin Dactylic Hexameters."

The observance of accent in dactylic verse is not due to the same cause that it is in iambic verse. In the latter, the shortening and weakening of the thesis (*i. e.* ἀρσις) rendered certain relations of ictus to accent unpleasant on their own account; whilst in dactylic hexameters, where the thesis retains the full time of the arsis, there was originally no influence of accent at all, as is shown by comparing Ennius with Homer *read with Latin accent*. But the mere form of the verse caused accent and ictus generally to fall together in the last two feet, and to come in conflict in the earlier feet. In the course of time this conflict or strife, followed by the agreement or reconciliation, was regarded as a peculiarity of the verse, and any verse not presenting it, seemed unusual and harsh. As we advance from Ennius to Ovid, we find each kind of poem becoming more and more carefully composed in this respect, but in such a way that one sort of composition may be rougher at a certain period than another sort at an earlier period. Thus, the Satires of Horace are not so carefully composed as the *De Rerum Natura* of Lucretius; and the *Elegies* of Catullus are more carefully written in this respect than even the Epistles of Horace; but they are not so carefully written as later *Elegies*.

In the following table are found some of the principal results of an examination of the Roman poets. The table is the average for every 1,000 hexameter verses, but does not in every case profess to be absolutely exact, as it is derived from only a partial reading (except for Ennius, Lucilius, Virgil, Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius).

	Ennius.	Lucll.	Lucret.	Hor. Sat.	Hor. Ep.	Virg.	Ov. Met.	Catull. El.	Tibull. El.	Propert. El.	Ov. El.
Caesurae after fifth arsis.											
(1) With conflict,	52	10	4	42	19	4	2	15	7	3	0
(2) Without conflict,	77	66	80	128	72	14	2	54	21	12	10
Caesurae in sixth foot.											
(1) With conflict,	74	36	36	58	36	4	0	18	0	0	0
(2) Without conflict,	9	25	20	59	51	11	4	21	4	18	2

It will be observed that the more perfect the art of composing became, the more the caesurae themselves were avoided in the last two feet, even when there was no conflict. This was, *first*, because in avoiding conflict, they unconsciously avoided that which was likely to lead to conflict; and, *secondly*, because the ending | ˘ | ˘ ˘ ˘ ˘ ˘ was harsh on account of a monosyllable being followed immediately by so long a word, and the ending | ˘ | ˘ ˘ | ˘ ˘ really caused a sort of conflict between the fifth ictus and the accent in the fifth thesis.

With regard to monosyllables at the end of a verse, it is to be observed that they generally do *not* cause surprise. Even in "ridiculus mus," the meaning of "ridiculus" leads us to *expect* something like "mus."

This monosyllable, when immediately preceded by another, is much employed to force the reader to connect two verses closely, when the sense requires. The accent and stress of the monosyllable prevents the voice from falling and pausing. (See Hor. Sat. *passim*).

The varied relation of ictus to accent in the two halves of the verse is made use of frequently to produce a pleasant play upon ictus and accent by repeating the same words with their relation changed, as Catul. LXII, 20-22:

Hespere, qui coelo fertur crudelior ignis?
qui *natám* possis *complexu* avellere *matris*,
cóplexu *matris* retinentem avellere *nátam*.

(See also Virg. Buc. VIII, 47-50, and in the poets generally.) Many special points, not contained in this abstract, were discussed.

The Secretary presented a communication from the Secretary of the American Anthropological Society, inviting the correspondence and coöperation of this Association.

On motion, it was

Resolved, That the Secretary be instructed to acknowledge and reply to this communication.

A recess was then taken till 4 o'clock P. M.

AFTERNOON SESSION.—4 P. M.

The Association met after the recess.

Mr. A. C. Merriam, of Columbia College, New York City, read a paper on "The Homeric *φίλος*."

This was an argument against the critical canon that *φίλος* in Homer is used as a synonym for the possessive pronoun. The first three books of Anthon's Homer being most widely used in this country in preparation for college were brought under review. Everywhere in the translations there given *φίλος* is rendered by the possessive pronoun, except four times in Γ. This destroys in a great measure the tone of the passage in the episode of Chryseis, A 20, 98, 441, 447; in that of Hephaistos, A 572, 578, 585, 587; of Patroclos, A 345, where the keynote of the later books is struck; and of the patriotic sentiment B 158, 162, 174, 178, Γ 244. With like strictness the rule is followed by Derby, Pope, Sotheby; less constantly by Herschel and Merivale: while Bryant, Blackie, Newman, Chapman, and the Latin version of the Ernesti-Clark edition, respond almost uniformly to the feeling of the poet. The scholia B. L. on A 20, have *ἐλευνὴ δὲ ἡ προσθήκη τοῦ φίλην*. Autenrieth, accepting a derivation from *σθε*, makes the *original* meaning possessive; but the derivation of *φίλος* is too doubtful to determine its meaning.

φίλος occurs in Il. and Od. between 500 and 600 times. As adjective not predicate or vocative with proper name, its usage may be divided into two classes. In a count only fairly exhaustive, 287 examples were found for

first class, 112 for second. Of the former number πατήρ claims 30, μήτηρ 11, πάππα 1, τέκνον 9, τέκος 16, νιός 69, παῖς 14, κασίγνητος 3, ἑκνυρός 1, μήτρως 1, ἀκοιτὶς 2, ἀκοίτης 2, κουρίδιος 1, ἄλοχος 12, πόσις 8, μαῖα 5, τροφός 6, νύμφα 1, ἑταῖρος 34, κεφάλη 2, ξείνος 4, ἀνὴρ 6, γέρων 2, θεός 1, μήδεα 1, γαῖα, αἶα, πατρίς 45. None of these words give offence in the English when connected with *dear*, and this translation is forced upon us when a limiting genitive or a possessive pronoun qualifies the same noun. This with νιός very common; Ὀδυσσεύος φίλος νιός at least 14 times. See also Δ 354, Β 260, π 222. Similarly Ν 427, Ο 639, Μ 355, Β 564, 713, Η 44, Ψ 289, Κ 50, ν 259, τ 455, Ξ 502, β 51, Ι 455. The possessive pronoun Ε 314, 318, Τ 132, Ζ 474, Π 447, Τ 4, Φ 330, 378, σ 214, ω 505, Ω 416, ξ 177, ν 413, χ 350.

The remark of Liddell and Scott on Ι 555, was met by showing that φίλη meant *once dear, normally dear*. Compare ἐρατεινά Φ 218, σιγαλόνετα ζ 26, φίλον Aesch. Choe. 616, λ 327, μακάριος Eur. Ores. 4, *libero* Hor. C. 3, 5, 22. Homer feels that the ties of affection between parent and child can never be destroyed. The evidence of the strength of the domestic affections in all the relations of life is cumulative throughout the poems. See Glad. Juv. Mund., pp. 396-8. Are we not then actually wronging Homer and the spirit of the Heroic Age by nullifying epithets, which, rightly understood, open to fair fields in that distant past?

The second class comprised θυμός found 12 times, αἰών 1, ἦτορ 48, κῆρ 12, στήθος 8, λαμβός 1, χεῖρ 9, γούνατα 7, γνῖα 3, βλέφαρα 2; also εἴματα 1, δῶρα 3, γέρας 1, δῶμα 1, οἰκία 1, δέμνια 1, νόστος 1. With these words the possessive translation of φίλος is almost universal; but, if we find the possessive pronoun or possessive genitive at the same time, this must show that the sense of *dear* was in such cases necessary, and consequently that the same sense was not incompatible when the pronoun was not used. With θυμός these not found, but a *quasi* possessive dative. With ἦτορ a genitive is found ε 297, 406, χ 147, Φ 114, ω 344, Φ 425, δ 703, ψ 205, χ 68, Ο 166, 182, the last a possessive. The pronominal dative is common. κῆρ has a genitive δ 270, κ 485; a possessive ι 413, π 274, and datives. στήθεσσι has genitive ν 9, and datives; γούνατα genitive ν 231, and datives; γνῖα genitive Ν 85, and datives. This gives fair ground for the conviction that φίλος was to Homer no empty epithet, nor even a possessive pronoun, but really meant with the words of the second class what it did with those of the first, a plump *dear*. The explanation of this phenomenon was conceived to be this: In many ways it is the youth of the world which the Homeric poems set before us in their childlike directness of expression and awkward fondness for calling a spade a spade, quite foreign to ourselves but often heard from the mouths of children before a conventional schooling has repressed the undisguised utterances of the feelings. The child will say "my poor dear hand" because it knows only to call that dear which is dear. The man avoids it as savoring of egotism. The Homeric man calls his hand *dear*, just as he calls it *stout* μ 174, or his thigh *thick* λ 231, or his house *beautiful* θ 41, or himself *valiant* Α 393; cf. ι 19, 20, τ 183, Η 75, Θ 22, etc. Were we to speak straight out from the heart, we should acknowledge that the bodily organs are dear to us; see Xen. Mem. 1, 2, 54, Cic. Lael. 81, Epigram of Maec. in Suet. We say, "run for dear life," "dear me." In

Hm. φίλον θυμὸν regularly of loss of life; cf. K 495, P 17, λ 109, χ 323, Π 82, X 58, ε 152. This idea of loss is to be considered B 261; cf. Z 272.

Another point to be taken into account in the explanation is the great fondness of the poet for personification. This figure is applied to the feet N 75, the hands ε 434; and the members of the body are sometimes treated as separate and distinct individualities apart from the person himself as ν 237, Δ 314, ε 355, ν 13-22. As soon as this was done, there is as good reason for applying the word dear to one's own hand, for instance, as to that of a second person.

Some kindred uses of our word dear were cited from Shakespeare, where it is used above 400 times; but the German exhibits the exactest parallel in *das liebe brod, lieben tag, liebe gott* (cf. ω 514, Theogn. 373) and in the application of *lieb* to *gelt, vieh, gut, rock* (cf. B 261), *sonne, herz*, etc.

In later Greek the application of φίλος to words of the first class is comparatively common, but with those of the second it is rare. The following were cited: Hes. W. & D. 360, Theog. 163, 568, 283, W. & D. 608; Hym. Ap. 113, 524, Epigr. 4 15, Tyrt. 10 25, 12 23, Theognis 531, 877, 983, Pseud. Phocyl. 98, Sim. Ceos 37 4, Iby. 4, Pind. Ol. 1 6, 24, Pyth. 3 109; Aesch. Choe. 276, 410, Agam. 983; Eur. Hek. 1026, Elec. 146; Theoc., 17 65, 7 104, 21 20; Mosch. 4 1, 15, 32, 51; Apoll. Rhod., 2 712, 1 281, 3 492.

These examples appear to show that a sense of the quaintness of this usage began to prevail long before the Attic period, but of the feeling that it was equivalent to a possessive pronoun, no evidence was seen. Neither does the canon appear to be laid down in the oldest scholia on the Il. the Ven. A. Dind.; but this and the scholia of the Od. treat φίλος as if to them it meant *dear*, cf. scholia on Od. 1 238: nor in the Lex. of Apollon., nor Hesych., nor Etymolog. Magnum, nor Suidas. But it appears in scholia B. L. V. on Il. 1 569 (see on I 555), and in Eusth., B 261, and most lexicons since.

In conclusion an earnest protest was entered against that kind of criticism which, in translating from the classic poets, would root out all the poetry, would carefully prune away all the peculiarities of the original, would in fact strip Homer of his φᾶρος and χιτὼν and array him in dress coat, vest, pants, immaculate tie and shirt-front, before permitting him to appear in modern society. There is wide difference of opinion as to methods in a poetic translation, but in the class-room the aim should be to reproduce the original with all possible fidelity. If Homer says that the wave *shouts*, let us not translate it *roar*; if he calls wine *honey-hearted*, let us follow Tennyson; if he calls the heart *dear* or *shaggy*, let us so translate. Like true archaeologists, let us dig for the genuine treasures of that distant day, and carefully preserve all we find. Shall Schliemann, shall Cesnola, put their treasures into the hands of the artist of to-day, to remold and refashion till all the pottery becomes Wedgwood or Sevres, and all the gold might have come from Paris or London?

Remarks were made upon this paper by Professor B. L. Gildersleeve, Professor W. W. Goodwin, and Professor E. North.

Dr. L. A. Sherman, of the Hopkins Grammar School, New Haven, Conn., then read a paper on "The Greek Article as a Pronoun."

This communication grew out of the conviction that the identity of the Greek and English articles, perhaps commonly assumed in teaching Greek, and certainly often implied in Greek grammars, was incorrect and misleading. The article of Greek is demonstrably stronger and nearer its pronoun-original than that of English. It is clear that the *ὁ ἡ τό* of Homer had commenced the same career of progressive weakening which is common to the history of the article generally; but it had not in the time of Plato and Xenophon descended through all the stages and touched bottom in the shape of a genuine article, as has the English from its equivalent original *se seo thāt* of Anglo-Saxon. It still remained a demonstrative in *οἱ μὲν, οἱ δέ* and some other expressions in Attic prose, and in varying instances in Attic poetry, as is admitted by all scholars. There was, therefore, a lingering consciousness in the Greek mind of a pronominal potentiality in the article. In the light of certain examples it was maintained that the article of Greek was very nearly like that of modern German, which retains so much of its old pronominal strength as to admit of standing as the representative of a noun alone. It was then urged that the article in prepositional phrases like *Μένων καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ, οἱ ἄμφι Πλάτωνα*, was more likely pronominal than article to an omitted *ἄνδρες*; as also the second article in *οἱ δ' ἵπποι ἅπαντες οἱ μετὰ Κίρον*, and in like examples.

It was argued further that, if these conclusions were correct, the interpretation of the article with the participle would need to be amended. It is unnatural to suppose that the participle was always substantived over the article, when the latter being so nearly a demonstrative had already so much of the substantive in its nature; but rather in an unknown proportion of instances it stood in predicative agreement with its so-called article. This view seems really suggested by the very statement of the best grammars (see Curtius' Schgr. § 581, anm.; Kühner, Ausf. Gr., § 461, 4, 5). With Kühner's statement that *εἰσὶν οἱ λέγονσι* sometimes gives way to *εἰσὶν οἱ λέγοντες* is to be associated the constant rendition of the article with participle in German and English grammars by a relative clause. If the participle be really, in the thought of the Greeks, a *nomen agentis*, it should be easier to deny the article a substantive value than we find it. In regard to the facts of the language, it seems to be clear, first, that the participle is not infrequently found in undoubted predicative agreement with an article known to be demonstrative, as the following familiar sentences illustrate: *Ἐνταῦθα διέσχον ἀλλήλων βασιλεῖς τε καὶ οἱ Ἑλλήνες ὥς τριάκοντα στάδια, οἱ μὲν διώκοντες τοὺς καθ' αὐτοὺς, ὥς πάντας νικῶντες· οἱ δὲ ἀρπάζοντες ὥς ἤδη πάντες νικῶντες* (Anab. I. x. § 4). Secondly, there are occasional instances where the participle must be regarded as in predicative agreement with article-forms not admitted to be demonstrative: . . . *καὶ τὴν Φωκαῖδα, . . . τὴν σοφὴν καὶ καλὴν λεγομένην εἶναι, λαμβάνει* (Anab. I. x. § 2). Thirdly, there are passages constantly met with in which not only greater

difficulties are encountered, but the thought seems distorted and shorn of its naturalness and force if the participle be taken as attributive. A single example will suffice: οἱ δὲ πολλέμιοι ὁρῶντες μὲν τοὺς ἄμφι Ξερίσοφον εἰπετέρως τὸ ἵδωρ περῶντας, ὁρῶντες δὲ τοὺς ἄμφι Ξενοφῶντα θέοντες εἰς τοῦμπαλιν, δέισαντες μὴ ἀποκλεισθεῖν, φεύγουσιν ἀνὰ κράτος . . (Anab. IV. iii. § 21). There seems little doubt that the lack of *nomina agentis* in Greek is in some measure supplied by the participle, but it would also seem a matter of judgment in each case whether the participle be so used or not.

Remarks were made upon this paper by Professor B. L. Gildersleeve, Professor W. W. Goodwin, and Professor A. Harkness.

Professor J. B. Sewall, of Thayer Academy, South Braintree, Mass., read a paper on "The Greek Indicative, Subjunctive, and Optative Moods: what is the distinction between them?"

I. It is obvious that the indicative, in general, predicates *fact as actual*. It is that form of the verb specially employed for the assertion of what is, was, or will be. E. g. Dem. 4:1, ἐπειδὴ κτλ.—The different uses of the indicative mood in the different kinds of sentences shows the same. Dem. 4:5,—4:30 (relative); 1:15,—4:47 (result, cf. Goodwin, Greek Moods and Tenses, § 65. 1, N. 5, and § 65. 3.); 4:36 (causal). After temporal particles signifying *until* and *before that* cf. also Goodwin G. M. T., § 66.

When a clause denotes a result not attained in past time, or an unattainable purpose in past time (after *iva*, etc.), or a wish for the contrary of what is taking or what has taken place, or a condition or conclusion contrary to fact, the same is apparent because the result not attained, the unattainable purpose, the contrary wish, and the contrary condition or conclusion, are all brought before the mind as the opposite actual facts.

We may call the indicative therefore *the mood of actual fact*.

II. The Subjunctive. Can we detect that essential character in those relations (condition, purpose, temporal limit, deliberation, etc.), which made the verb-form we call the subjunctive a mood by itself, not the indicative, not the optative, not the imperative? Let us see.

In Dem. 4:3, ἵν' εἰδῇτε κτλ, what is the element, essential and common, in εἰδῇτε, a subjunctive in a clause of purpose, and in ὀλγυρῶντε (same sentence), a subjunctive in a conditional clause? Not simply futurity. They do not predicate actions which are actually to, or will certainly, take place, nor actions which are mere possibilities, potential—actions existing only in thought or conception as βούλοισθε (same sentence). The facts they predicated were rather before the speaker's mind as hoped or expected, in the one case, and in the other, as feared or deprecated—facts something more than mere conceptions, and much less than actual—rather, lying in the region, so to speak, between actuality and mere conception; the region of doubt, uncertainty, dependence; the region of facts dependent in some way upon *will* or other power and determination than the speaker's; a kind of fact to which the term *contingent* may very well be applied.

The same is clearly to be seen in Dem. 4:17, 22, 41,—Plato 230, E., and all similar examples.

This being the nature of the subjunctive, it is easy to see how it came to be used in the form called deliberative, and in exhortations and prohibitions, and with the value of an emphatic future after *οὐ μή*, and also why the indicative sometimes replaces it in final clauses (after *ὅπως*, etc.), and after verbs of striving and fearing by which the form of statement was made more vivid, viz.: for the reason that the indicative was the mood of actual, while the subjunctive was the mood of contingent fact. And to say with reference to *μή* with the perfect indicative expressing a fear that something has already happened, that "the difference between this and the perfect subjunctive is often very slight, the latter expressing rather a fear that *something may hereafter prove to have happened*" (Goodwin, G. M. T., § 46, note 5, b), is only to say, that, in this case, the indicative is used for actual, and the subjunctive for contingent, fact.

III. The Optative. The position of Rost, Kühner, Donaldson, and others, that this mood is nothing but a peculiar form of the subjunctive, and that they differ in tense only, is very properly discarded by our best and latest Greek scholars. This can only be however on the ground that there is an essential difference—a modal rather than a temporal difference.

The optative received its name from the early grammarians from its use in wishes, but this evidently was not its original, as it was not its principal, use. Its principal use lay in the protasis and apodosis of conditional sentences, in final clauses to denote past purpose, in oratio obliqua and after *ἔως*, *μέχρι* *ὅτ*, etc., after historical tenses. In these different positions it is easy to see that the optative was the form of the verb employed when the act or state to be predicated was merely *conceptional*, not brought before the mind as actual either in the present, past, or future, nor as contingent, but as merely conceived. E. g. Dem. 4:25, *εἰ γὰρ ἐροῖτό τις **** εἰποι* 'άν, 'for if any one should ask **** you would say,' the fact predicated in both condition and conclusion is not predicated as actual, nor in any way contingent, but as merely conceived. It is pure supposition, mere thought as Madvig says. So elsewhere. For an example of final clause (taken at random) see Xen. Anab. II. 6, 21, and oratio obliqua Thucyd. 2:13. In the latter example our English idiom has no other form for the clause *ὅτι Ἀρχίδαμος μὲν οἱ ξένος εἰη* than the blunt factual indicative, that Archidamus *was* his friend; and if Thucydides had made the statement on his own authority, he would have said *Ἀρχίδαμος μὲν οἱ ξένος ἦν*. But he attributes it to Pericles, and that carries it out of the region of actual fact as far as he himself is concerned, and he employs the mood which his mother tongue provides him with to express it separate from all actuality, fact as it exists merely in the conception.

We may call the optative mood, therefore, *the mood of conceived fact*.

My conclusion accordingly is, that the distinction between the Greek indicative, subjunctive, and optative moods is an essential one, one of kind and not of degree merely, the indicative being in general the mood of *actual fact*, the subjunctive that of *contingent fact*, and the optative that of *conceived fact*.

And a corollary from this would be that the distinction between the subjunctive and optative moods in conditional sentences is not one merely

of degree, but of kind—not one merely of greater or less vividness, but of essential nature, which supports a position assumed in a former paper (Trans. Phil. Asso., 1874).

The Auditors of the Treasurer's Report reported that they found it correct; and it was, on motion, accepted.

A recess was then taken till 8 o'clock P. M.

EVENING SESSION.—8 P. M.

The Association met after the recess.

The annual address was delivered by the President, Professor B. L. Gildersleeve, of Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

At the meeting of the Philological Association in New York two years ago, the President, Professor Harkness, gave a comprehensive survey of the progress and results of philological study during the last century, in which he laid especial stress on the origin and growth of comparative philology and linguistic science, and impressed upon the members of the Association the duty of carrying forward the good work that had been begun by others. The concluding exhortation of that address has suggested the theme of this—the Special Province of the American Philologist.

Many fields of philology are as open to Americans as to any devotees of linguistic science, and some philological work is peculiarly our own. So it would be sheer laches in us to resign the department of American languages. And although the history of this Association shows that there is no danger of this, the very fact that so much has been done, pledges us to still greater activity in this department, which is always challenging exploration. As the aboriginal languages of America demand our special care by reason of our local relations, so our historical connection makes English a matter of prime interest to us, and American scholars have done admirable work here, and in some of its forms the historical and scientific study of English has more votaries in America than can be found anywhere else. But outside of these departments, which are ours by local and historical ties, the power of individual effort and individual example has been strikingly manifested in the Sanskrit studies that have made a name all over the world for the distinguished scholar, whose absence we deplore, and have established the science of comparative etymology in this country on a sound basis. In all the leading branches of philological work there are gratifying signs of life, and our associates who are pushing forward the study of the Germanic and the Romance languages, and the Orientalists of this Association and of our sister society show no lack of activity. But it must be admitted that the prospect is not so good for the classical philologist as for those who are at work in less crowded fields, and as they in an especial manner need a word of encouragement, this discourse is addressed especially to them. There are indeed some grounds for the despondency of the classical philologist,

who is aiming at higher work, but there is no reason for despair. The preparation furnished by our schools and academies is very defective, but it was a great deal worse a few decades since. The isolation from other workers is chilling, and yet it is not so entire as it once was, and this Association has done much to bring philologists nearer to each other, although the intervals of meeting are so great. The want of a channel of intercommunication other than the annual volume of transactions is one cause why philological productivity is so slight in this country, for men cease to produce, if there is no outlet for production; but as soon as the want is properly presented, it will certainly be supplied, and the establishment of a philological journal will not and cannot long be deferred. The most serious drawback that we have to encounter is the want of apparatus; but perhaps even that is exaggerated. In the matter of occasional monographs, the increasing facilities of the book-trade brings certainly as many within our reach as can be procured in small German towns, in which excellent work is done for all that; and besides it is unwise to attach too much importance to these dissertations, a large proportion of which are written by very young men and have no great scientific value. But even if all the literature were accessible, every edition of every author, every treatise on every subject, it would not be desirable to dull the freshness of appreciation which can only be gained by direct employment with the text—with the theme. The field of antique literature is vast, but it is a narrow range as compared with the continent of commentary and dissertation, and any competent man can survey with his own eyes large stretches of the original sources of all our knowledge and so gain new points of view as well as new illustrations for the work he may have in hand. Let any man try what can be done by close study of a text, and a wide range of reading in cognate directions, before he says that Americans have nothing to do except to repeat the references in German books, or at most to run over the indexes of German editions.

Of course, if in our authorship we persist in treading the eternal round of school-books, there will be less room for individual effort, but even in the most thoroughly beaten track of classic literature, there is something yet to be settled; and if we look at our work from its historical and aesthetic sides, all of it requires to be done over every few years. With the progress of social science, with the advancing knowledge of historical evolution, the problems of antique culture, of antique legislation, appear in new lights. Not to speak of the positive gain to be derived from the newly-discovered inscriptions and monuments, which are adding more and more definiteness to our conceptions of the antique world, and are helping us to a better understanding of the dialectic life of the classic languages, and the cantonal and provincial life of the classic peoples, ancient history has to be interpreted into terms of American experience; and it is not saying too much to say that some phases of American life enable us to understand the ancients better than some contemporaries on the other side can do. But apart from the special aptitude of Americans for the appreciation of the political and social relations of antiquity, due partly to our peculiar endowment, partly to our peculiar position, the aesthetic

problems involved in the study of classical philology shift from time to time; the great masters ever need new interpreters. Even the best work done forty or fifty years ago leaves us thoroughly dissatisfied. Not only is there that sense of shortcoming which we feel in all translations, but there is often a repulsive, often a ludicrous incongruity, which shows the change of aesthetic basis. Now Americans have proved and are proving every day that they do not lack acuteness, subtlety, delicate appreciation, and just comprehension in their literary criticisms, but, so far as I know, there has been little independent treatment of the antique authors in this regard. Nor is it unworthy of consideration whether the exact study of function—to use a wider word than syntax—may not be destined to give us a firmer foundation and a clearer outline for the whole structure of style than would have been thought possible some years ago. Indeed this study of syntax or of function—comparative syntax, historical syntax—is large enough to occupy all the force that classical philology can spare for generations to come. No index will serve the turn of the true investigator, because no index-maker can possibly anticipate all the points of view which the thoughtful student will assume, so that it is simply indispensable that the student shall have immediate vision, immediate intercourse with the authors themselves, and if a second-hand acquaintance is of little use in this field of study, it is of no possible avail in yet another direction—the exploration of the linguistic consciousness of the great classic authors—a direction in which something yet remains to be discovered. The conclusion of the whole matter is that the classical philologists of America are in nowise debarred from high scientific work, and especially in the province of grammar, this *θριγκὸς μαθημάτων* as Boeckh has called it, may the American philologist find abundant room for the native sagacity, the unresting energy, the quick inventiveness that have distinguished our people in other departments of science.

At the conclusion of the President's address, the Association adjourned to 9 o'clock Thursday morning.

THURSDAY, July 11.

The Association resumed its session at 9 o'clock A. M., the President in the chair.

The minutes of the sessions of the previous day were read and approved.

The Secretary presented a report from the Executive Committee, announcing the election to membership of,

Professor C. R. Hemphill, Theological Seminary, Columbia, S. C.

The committee on the time and place of the next meeting recommended that the next meeting be held at Newport, R. I., during the second week of July, 1879.

On motion, it was

Resolved, That the report of the committee on the time and place of the next meeting be accepted, and that the Secretary be instructed to send to the members a printed circular, mentioning the place appointed for the next meeting, and requesting each member to send word, whether he would prefer the date appointed, or a later week in July. [See page 36.]

On motion, it was

Resolved, That the Secretary be instructed to send to the members a printed circular embodying the substance of the report presented on Tuesday evening by the Committee on the Reform of English Spelling.

The committee to nominate officers for the next year presented nominations as follows:

For *President*—Professor J. B. Sewall, Thayer Academy, Braintree, Mass.

For *Vice-Presidents*—Professor C. H. Toy, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky.; President William C. Cattell, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.

For *Secretary and Curator*—Professor Thomas C. Murray, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

For *Treasurer*—Charles J. Buckingham, Esq., Poughkeepsie, N. Y.

For additional members of the *Executive Committee*—

Professor W. W. Goodwin, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

Professor M. W. Humphreys, Vanderbilt University, Louisville, Ky.

Professor F. A. March, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.

Dr. J. Hammond Trumbull, Hartford, Conn.

Professor W. D. Whitney, Yale College, New Haven, Conn.

The report was accepted, and the persons therein named were declared elected to the offices to which they were respectively nominated.

Professor B. L. Gildersleeve, of Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md., then read a paper entitled "Contributions to the History of the Articular Infinitive in Greek."

The use of the articular infinitive completes the deorganization of the infinitive in Greek. Deorganized before, the infinitive had virtually become an accusative to the Greek consciousness, yet in many of its combinations retains traces of its dative origin. Indeed the dative of the object for which and the accusative of result meet in most of the familiar constructions of the infinitive. Not only in case, however, but also in tense there must have been a change in the relation of the infinitive to meet the necessities of *oratio obliqua*. So the future infinitive, old as it is, seems to be younger than the other tenses of the infinitive, as the future optative is demonstrably younger than the other tenses of the optative. The connect-

ing link between the verbs of creation (verbs of will and endeavor), which take the abstract infinitive (neg. μή), and the verbs of saying and thinking, which take the *oratio obliqua* infinitive (neg. οὐ) is formed by verbs of swearing, witnessing, and hoping, in which the use of the negatives and of the tenses seems to show the transition. Now as the articular infinitive is younger than the *oratio obliqua* inf., it would seem to follow that the *oratio obliqua* inf. would be susceptible of the article, a point which must be admitted to some extent for the articular inf. and ἄν and the articular fut. inf.—both comparatively rare combinations. The truth seems to be that the articular infinitive may represent the contents of an *oratio obliqua* sentence without losing, however, its abstract character, which abstract character is sufficiently indicated by the negative μή.

As to the history of the articular infinitive, the construction does not occur in Homer, the only apparent example (Od. 20, 52) being in apposition to a demonstrative article.

In Pindar it occurs ten times—all except one example being apparently in the nom. but all in such a position as to vindicate a virtual accusative use.

In Aeschylus the occurrences are one in 159 verses. The cases are chiefly nominative and accusative. Many of the examples are due to the stereotyped grouping of τὸ μή, τὸ μή οὐ. Prepositions are very sparingly used. The tenses are present and aorist.

In Sophocles the occurrences are one in 120 verses. The vast mass consists of nominatives and accusatives; there are very few genitives and datives. Prepositions are used sparingly. The tenses with no exceptions worth considering are present and aorist. A remarkable instance of what may be called substantivized *oratio obliqua* occurs in Antig. 235. 6.

In Euripides there is a marked falling off; but one occurrence in 320 verses. Forty per cent. of the whole number are nominatives, but the genitive bulks much more largely than it does in the others. Prepositions and quasi-prepositions are not much used. The tenses are present and aorist, εἰδισθαί being a practical present. There is somewhat more freedom in the handling. The largest number occurs in the Iphigenia at Aulis.

In Aristophanes we note an increase as compared with Euripides, one occurrence in 258 verses. The bulk consists of nominatives and accusatives. Prepositions are not very common. The tenses are present and aorist (εἰσθέναι being a practical present). A large proportion of the articular infinitives in Aristophanes are purely deictic or anaphoric, some exclamatory, others parodic. The largest number occurs in the latest comedy, the Plutus.

Of the historians Herodotus uses the articular inf. very rarely in comparison with Thucydides. Few prepositions are employed. Remarkable is the use of ἀντί directly with the infinitive. While the bulk of Thucydides is only about six to Herodotus's seven, Thucydides uses the articular infinitive with great freedom and more than eight times as often. All the cases and fifteen different prepositions are freely used. Also all the tenses. Especially noteworthy are the articular inf. with ἄν and the articular fut. inf.

In the orators the usage varies greatly, the occurrence to the Teubner page being for

Lysias, about12
Andocides (estimated),20
Isaeus,25
Aeschines,30
Antiphon (estimated),50
Lycurgus,60
Isocrates,60
Deinarchus (estimated),80
Demosthenes (private orations),80
(public orations),	1.25

The lowest average of the undoubted public speeches is presented by the Second Philippic .87; the highest by the First Olynthiac 2.75. The long public speeches vary from 1.06 to 1.62. In the private orations there is considerable variation, the highest being *contra Cononem* 1.07, and *in Pantaenetum* 1.06, the lowest *contra Calliclem* in which there is no occurrence.

Professor M. W. Humphreys, of Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn., next read a paper on "Elision, especially in Greek."

In this paper the position was taken that elision in Greek was usually total.

1. The words employed by the Greeks to denote elision were discussed.

2. The ancients used their terms carelessly, and sometimes used the same word to denote both crasis and elision. The passage cited by Corsen to prove partial elision really referred to crasis, as the illustration shows: Ἔστι δὲ συναλοιφή δύο φωνηέντων διηρημένων εἰς μίαν συλλαβὴν ἔνωσις, οἷον τὸ ὄνομα, τοῦ νομα.

3. Discussion of Ahrens' arguments.

(a). Ahrens says that *some words would be unpronounceable if elision were total, as ἐσθλ', σέμν', αἰσχρ', etc., etc.* But as he asserts that elision combines two words, why may they not be combined by omitting the vowel and pronouncing a consonant at the beginning of the next word: σέμ-νέπη?

(b). *Sometimes a hiatus would remain "causing an unpleasantness that evidently is not in it."* How does he know there is nothing unpleasant in it? Compare Sanskrit *vanē āsit*, *vana āsit*. But granted there is no offense in it; the two words being uttered continuously would prevent offense except such as exists where two consecutive vowels occur in one word. And there would be great offense in ἀλγε' ἔθηκεν, if we pronounce the elided *a* a little according to Ahrens' theory.

(c). The scholia on ἐκ κυμάτων γὰρ αὐθις αὐ γαλήν' ὁρῶ were discussed.

(d). Ahrens' interpretation of *συναλοιφή* discussed, and ancient definitions cited.

4. The Greeks allowed hiatus in prose. They could always neglect elision (in prose); but they could also elide under certain conditions. Hence they had the choice between the two. Not so in Latin, where elision was almost universal (Cic. Or. 44, 152). In poetry Greeks avoided

hiatus. This restriction with the requirements of metre sometimes caused elision even before a long pause. *Then* the elision was *only partial*, and sometimes even *only apparent*; i. e. the verse merely appeared perfect to the eye. Hence they felt at liberty either to elide totally or partially as circumstances demanded (a subject to be discussed in another paper). But that vowels could be and often were *totally suppressed*, is shown by these considerations:

(a). The aspirate of an initial vowel passes over to the (remaining) final consonant, as ἐφ' ἡμῖν.

(b). The accent, when final, is thrown back, as ἐσθλ', σέμν' (words cited by Ahrens). Aphaeresis of accented vowels (aphaeresis is *partial*) and the Sanskrit *svarita* show the possibility of accenting a reduced vowel; hence the elided vowel was not merely reduced. (Arguments proving aphaeresis *partial*, omitted.) Analogous to *svarita* is Synizesis, as Αἰγυπτίους (3 syl.)

(c). Diphthongs are frequently elided. If the second vowel merely combines with the next vowel, then the first retains its full quantity.

(d). Such plays upon expressions as γ' ἐπαυος = γέπαυος (see Ahrens *de Crasi et Aphaeresi*, p. 2) show total elision.

(e). Ὀπδραν, ὄραν, γάρ, γοῖν, etc., show that a vowel was totally expelled. This happens in Latin much more rarely, as in *tantopere*, whereas we find *neuter, deinde*, etc., resulting from *partial* elision (for in Latin elision was *partial* except in -que, -ve, -ne).

(f). If elision had been only a diminution, it would not have been subject to such rigid restrictions, but would have been more nearly universal, as in Latin.

5. But vowels were also only *partially* elided under certain circumstances.

(a). We find elision at the end of a sentence. That we find it also at the end of a verse proves nothing, for when this happens the sense always requires the verses to be read continuously.

(b). Elision takes place between two speakers. Here, in fact, the elision is entirely for the eye of the reader. As the first speaker uttered his final vowel, the second speaker began his first syllable, and so a rapid exchange of words is secured.

6. That elision was only *partial* in Latin is shown by the fact that it was so universal (Cic. Or. 44, 152). In *tantopere, magnopere*, the long-continued juxtaposition led to the suppression, especially as the vowels were similar. The absence of *crasis* also proves it. The nearest approach to it is in *cogere, deerrare*, etc. In *amatast*, the quantity results from *position*, as is shown by "corrūpērē's ausus," "vëndērē's ausus" (Tibullus, I, 9; 53, 57). Some statements of grammarians imply *partial* elision. Some late grammarians speak of it as if it were total; but their authority is worthless. That -que, -ve, -ne suffered total elision will appear in another paper.

Mr. A. D. Savage, of Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md., next read a paper on "Ῥαδαμάνθυος ὄρκος, or Did the notion of irreverence in swearing exist among the Greeks?"

This paper is a discussion of Greek views of the moral side of swearing. Ῥαδαμάνθυος ὄρκος is the name found in scholia, lexica, etc., of oaths by

animals and plants. The reason given by the scholiasts is, a wish not to use the names of gods in swearing. Of the passages in scholiasts, etc., which mention this oath, two may be regarded as the sources of the others, Schol. Aristoph. Av. 521, and Schol. Plat. Apol., 21 E. The earliest appearance of the above-mentioned reason is in a fragment of Sosicrates given by Schol. Aristoph. Av., 521. Sosicrates flourished not later than 150 B. C. It would be expected that such a notion as the irreverence of swearing among pagans would be made the most of by the Greek fathers of the church. But even the fathers do not condemn swearing for that reason. Again, when the moral side of swearing is touched upon in the literature of Greece and Rome, the grounds for condemnation are those of the fathers; either, that it is better to be on the safe side of perjury, or that a man of honor should on common occasions expect his word to be sufficient. This might lead us to suspect that the notion of irreverence (provided we thus interpret the words of the scholiasts) came to them from the grammarians of Alexandria, for this notion existed then in that part of the world, among Israelites and Egyptians. An examination, however, of the passages in classical Greek authors, in whom the oath of Rhadamanthus is found, leads to the view, first, that the names of dogs, geese, and plants were substituted reverentially for the names of gods by some persons whose piety unhappily was tainted with weakness; and in the second place that such oaths gained only the sneers of the more enlightened. Socrates swears by the dog and the plane-tree, but he also swears by the gods. Hence the inference that with Socrates it was not in earnest. In Aristoph. Av., 521, we are told that the prophet Lampon swears an oath by the goose, when he has a bit of swindling to do. And in Aristoph. Vesp., 83, the speaker swears by the dog, and calls Nicostratus a dirty beast (*καταπίγων*). Hence in the eyes of Aristophanes this oath was silly. A fragment from Cratinus preserved by the Schol. Apol., 21 E. says οἷς ἦν μέγιστος ὄρκος ἅπαντι λόγῳ κύων. ἔπειτα χήν θεοὺς δ' ἐσίγων. This makes it plain that there were people who swore by dogs and geese instead of gods. We may take the words of the Scholiasts to mean reverence, and use them here. The writer of the paper would incline to the view that Cratmus's mention of the oath is satirical.

Remarks were made upon this paper by Dr. Julius Sachs and Dr. J. H. Trumbull.

Professor T. D. Seymour, of Western Reserve College, Hudson, Ohio, then read the last paper of the session, "On the Composition of the Cyngeticus of Xenophon."

It was the aim of the paper to show that the assumption of certain interpolations removed or explained most of the difficulties which abound in the treatise, and restored the work nearly to the form which its author gave it.

Since Valckenaer, few have maintained the authenticity of the prooemium or the epilogus; but L. Dindorf, in the last critical edition (Oxford '66) thinks that sufficient evidence has not been brought forward to decide against the genuineness of the treatise itself, and it is to be observed that

all the critics seem to have assailed or defended the Xenophonticity of the work as a whole and on general grounds.

So much of Xenophon's life was spent on campaigns in Asia Minor and in Peloponnesus that we are not surprised to find a large number of poetic and dialectic words in his writings. Hence it is impossible to attach much importance to the unusual words in the *Cynegeticus*. But the characteristics of his style are well known. We have from his pen voluminous works on varied subjects and written at every period of his life.

In this opusculum one peculiarity of style to be noticed is the frequent occurrence of *Asyndeta*. Xenophon is not averse to the rhetorical employment of *Asyndeton* as *Hist. Graec.* iv. 3, 19—*ἰωθοῦντο, ἐμάχοντο, ἀπέκτεινον, ἀπέθνησκον* and even where there is less animation, as *Anab.* vi. 1. 6, the Greeks at *Κάλπης Διμήν* are said to plunder *πυροὺς καὶ κριθάς, οἶνον, ὄσπρια, μελίνας, σῦκα*. But in all of Xenophon's larger works there are not so many examples as in this one treatise and none like those in *Cyn.* v. 30. cf. also iv. 1 and vi. 1.

Another peculiarity is the use of the infinitive, e. g. ix. 1, *εἶναι* and x. 1 *κεκτῆσθαι*. In v. 15 we have *λαμβάνειν* tho no *χρή* or *δεῖ* has been used in the chapter. In most cases a direction is clearly implied, and the infinitive must depend on the general idea of advice which pervades the work, and which is stated at the beginning of ii. 2: *ὅσα δὲ καὶ οἷα δεῖ παρεσκευασμένον ἔλθειν ἐπ' αὐτὸ φράσω καὶ αὐτὰ καὶ τὴν ἐπιστήμην ἐκάστων*. But it is more than seven pages after this that the first example of the unusual infinitive occurs.

The paper next noticed the peculiarities in the use of prepositions in this treatise. Beginning with i. 18, the part of the work most Xenophontic in character, forty-six of the first one hundred verbs are compounded with prepositions—nearly the proportion in Xenophon's larger works—while in *Chap. v.*, fifty-eight of the first one hundred verbs are so compounded, often with no sensible difference of meaning from the simple verbs. Further, an unusual number of verbs are compounded with two or more prepositions; and the same preposition is repeated with the noun about ten times as frequently as on the same number of pages in the *Memorabilia* or *Cyropaedia*. This indicates, of course, a later authorship for the passages where such peculiarities are found. The preposition is sometimes irregularly omitted, as iv. 9; *εἰς τὰ ὄρη πολλὰκις, τὰ δὲ ἔργα ἤπτον*.

Διά with the genitive is noticeable in iii. 5: *διατρέχουσι διὰ τοῦ ἰχθυος*. Cf. iv. 3: *προΐψαν διὰ τοῦ ἰχθυος*, also vi. 22 and x. 16. The use of *μεταξὺ* is not Xenophontic in v. 8 *ἀποθεν πολὺ, μικρόν, μεταξὺ τούτων*, cf. iv. 1.

Another particle to be noticed is *ὅτε*. Never used by Xenophon, it is found here four times, v. 8 and 20, ix. 8 and 20.

The use of the plural of abstract nouns was noted, e. g. ii. 7: *ἀσύνμετροι τὰ πάχη πρὸς τὰ μήκη*. iii. 3: *σκληραὶ τὰ εἶδη*. iv. 1: *τὰ μεγέθη μεταξὺ μακρῶν καὶ βραχέων*. The omission of the reflexive pronoun, specially with *ῥιπτῶ* and its compounds, is unusual. The use of periphrastic expressions, most frequently with *ἔχειν*, as iv. 8: *ἔχουσαι ἔστωσαν κτλ*, was noticed.

These peculiarities will be recognized at once as common in a later age, and where many of them are found in any passage they afford a presumption of later authorship than Xenophon.

The result of the investigation is as follows: Xenophon began with I. 18. After II. 8 there is a long interpolation reaching to VI. 7. After VI. 16 six §§ are inserted by the reviser. Chap. VII is genuine with the exception of two or three short clauses and most of §§ 5 and 8. Chap. VIII is doubtful. Chap. IX has interpolated §§ 8-10, 13-16, 19-20. In Chap. X §§ 4-18 and part of § 22 are late. Chap. XI presents few peculiarities of style, but the unusual use of *μετά* § 3, would suggest that it is not Xenophon's. Moreover our author is accustomed to write from his personal experiences, of which there are few traces here. Chap. XII may well be genuine as far as § 16 where the original work ends.

This scheme assigns to Xenophon less than half of the work before us, but it removes or explains nine-tenths of the difficulties and leaves us a more systematic treatise with a beginning, an end, and a well-ordered middle. It deprives us of Xenophon's authority for some stories which savor more of Aelian, and removes many sentences full of unnatural rhetoric, but does not remove anything in which the style of Xenophon is marked.

Who the interpolator was it is perhaps useless to inquire. He evidently lived before the time of Arrian, as the prooemium is referred to by the latter author. He seems to have changed the original text in but a few places, generally contenting himself with inserting whole sections or longer passages.

On motion, it was

Resolved, That the thanks of the Association be tendered to the proprietors of the Grand Union Hotel, for the use of this Opera Hall, and for their courteous attentions to the members of the Association.

On motion, the Association, at 1.30 o'clock, p. m., adjourned.

CHARLES J. BUCKINGHAM, *Treasurer, in Account with the AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION,*
July 10, 1877-July 8, 1878.

<i>D.R.</i>		<i>C.R.</i>	
Balance in Treasury, July 10, 1877,	\$655.01	Printing "Proceedings" and "Transactions,"	\$560.87
Fees and assessments since received,	335.00	Expenses of session in Baltimore,	15.00
Sales of publications,	71.50	" " Secretary, Postages and Expressages,	16.48
Interest,	52.60	" " Distributing "Transactions,"	16.10
Balance received from the Secretary,	11.21	" " Treasurer, Postages and Collections,	5.00
		Amount voted, at Baltimore, for clerk hire, and other expenses paid Secretary,	50.00
		Balance in Treasury, July 8, 1878,	461.87
	\$1,125.32		\$1,125.32

E. E. CHARLES J. BUCKINGHAM, *Treasurer.*

There is also in the hands of the Treasurer, one Bond of the Connecticut Western Railroad, for Five Hundred Dollars, with five over-due coupons of the same, of \$17.50 each, not at present collectible.

Having examined the above account, and compared it with the vouchers, we certify the same to be correct. We have also personally examined the Bond of the Connecticut Western Railroad, with five over-due and unpaid coupons.

(Signed) W. C. CATTELL, } *Auditing Committee.*
M. W. HUMPHREYS, }

OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION.

1878-79.



PRESIDENT.

JOTHAM B. SEWALL.

VICE-PRESIDENTS.

CRAWFORD H. TOY,
WILLIAM C. CATTELL.

SECRETARY AND CURATOR.

THOMAS C. MURRAY.

TREASURER.

CHARLES J. BUCKINGHAM.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

The officers above named, and—
WILLIAM W. GOODWIN,
MILTON W. HUMPHREYS,
FRANCIS A. MARCH,
J. HAMMOND TRUMBULL,
WILLIAM D. WHITNEY.

MEMBERS OF THE AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION.

Frederic D. Allen, Mt. Auburn, Cincinnati, O.
Joseph H. Allen, Cambridge, Mass.
William F. Allen, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.
Joseph Anderson, Waterbury, Conn.
N. L. Andrews, Madison University, Hamilton, N. Y.
Albert N. Arnold, Baptist Theological Seminary, Chicago, Ill.
Cecil F. P. Bancroft, Phillips Academy, Andover, Mass.
Stephen G. Barnes, Iowa College, Grinnell, Iowa.
Charles C. Bates, Plymouth, Mass.
H. Louis Baugher, Pennsylvania College, Gettysburg, Pa.
S. E. W. Becker, Wilmington, Del.
J. B. Bittinger, Sewickly, Pa.
Porter C. Bliss, office of "Library Table," New York City.
James R. Boise, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
Charles E. Brandt, Farmington, Conn.
H. C. G. Brandt, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
Fisk P. Brewer, Iowa College, Grinnell, Iowa.
John A. Broadus, Southern Baptist Theol. Seminary, Louisville, Ky.
Charles J. Buckingham, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
L. H. Buckingham, English High School, Boston, Mass.
Elihu Burritt, New Britain, Conn.
Henry F. Burton, University of Rochester, Rochester, N. Y.
Richard E. Call, Mohawk, N. Y.
W. B. Carr, Petersburg, Va.
Franklin Carter, Yale College, New Haven, Conn.
William C. Cattell, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.
Talbot W. Chambers, 70 West Thirty-sixth street, New York City.
Henry L. Chapman, Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Me.
Elie Charlier (Life Member), Central Park, New York City.
Francis J. Child, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
Lyman Coleman, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.
George F. Comfort, Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y.
Jacob Cooper, New Brunswick, N. J.
A. Crittenden, Packer Collegiate Institute, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Howard Crosby, University of New York, New York City.
Edward P. Crowell, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.
Mrs. M. W. DeMunn, Providence, R. I.
Schele de Vere, University of Virginia, Va.
Mary C. Dickinson, 173 Madison street, Toledo, O.

- Martin L. D'Ooge, Michigan University, Ann Arbor, Mich.
 T. T. Eaton, Petersburg, Va.
 B. H. Engbers, Mt. St. Mary's Seminary, Cincinnati, O.
 George R. Entler, Franklin, N. Y.
 Carl W. Ernst, Providence, R. I.
 O. M. Fernald, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass.
 Gustavus Fischer, Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N. J.
 M. M. Fisher, University of the State of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.
 Alexander Fleischmann, Cazenovia Seminary, Cazenovia, N. Y.
 H. H. Furness, Ph.D., 222 West Washington square, Philadelphia, Pa.
 James M. Garnett, St. John's College, Annapolis, Md.
 B. L. Gildersleeve, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
 D. C. Gilman, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
 William W. Goodwin, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
 Richard T. Greener, Howard University, Washington, D. C.
 James B. Greenough, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
 Ephraim W. Gurney, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
 S. S. Haldeman (University of Pennsylvania), Chickies, Pa.
 Albert Harkness, Brown University, Providence, R. I.
 William R. Harper, Denison University, Granville, O.
 Samuel Hart, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.
 Charles R. Hemphill, Theological Seminary, Columbia, S. C.
 Theophilus Heness, School of Modern Languages, Cambridge, Mass.
 Thomas Wentworth Higginson, Newport, R. I.
 George O. Holbrooke, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.
 E. S. Holden, U. S. Naval Observatory, Washington, D. C.
 Selah Howell, Christian Biblical Institute, Stanfordville, N. Y.
 Milton W. Humphreys, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.
 John T. Huntington, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.
 Edwin E. Johnson, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.
 Asahel C. Kendrick, University of Rochester, Rochester, N. Y.
 Robert P. Keep, Williston Seminary, Easthampton, Mass.
 John B. Kieffer, Mercersburg College, Mercersburg, Pa.
 D. B. King, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.
 Louis Kistler, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.
 Charles R. Lanman, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
 Albert G. Lawrence, Newport, R. I.
 R. F. Leighton, Brooklyn, N. Y.
 John M. Leonard, University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.
 John R. Leslie, Newport, R. I.
 William S. Liscomb, Providence, R. I.
 Thomas R. Lounsbury, Yale College, New Haven, Conn.
 Rebecca S. Lowrey, 162 West Forty-seventh street, New York City.
 Merrick Lyon, University Grammar School, Providence, R. I.
 W. G. McCabe, Petersburg, Va.
 Joseph H. McDaniels, Hobart College, Geneva, N. Y.
 Francis A. March, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.
 D. S. Martin, Rutgers Female College, New York City.

- R. H. Mather, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.
Charles M. Mead, Andover Theological Seminary, Andover, Mass.
John Meigs, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.
Augustus C. Merriam, Columbia College, New York City.
Charles D. Morris, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
F. A. Muhlenberg, Univ. of Penn. (4307 Walnut street), Philadelphia, Pa.
Thomas C. Murray, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
Joseph H. Myers, Milton-on-Hudson, N. Y.
C. K. Nelson, St. John's College, Annapolis, Md.
Edward North, Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y.
Howard Osgood, Rochester Theological Seminary, Rochester, N. Y.
Charles P. Otis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Boston, Mass.
W. B. Owen, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.
Lewis R. Packard, Yale College, New Haven, Conn.
William A. Packard, College of New Jersey, Princeton, N. J.
E. G. Parsons, Sumner Academy, South Byfield, Mass.
Tracy Peck, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.
William T. Peck, High School, Providence, R. I.
William C. Poland, Brown University, Providence, R. I.
Noah Porter, Yale College, New Haven, Conn.
Samuel Porter, National Deaf-Mute College, Washington, D. C.
John W. Powell, Washington, D. C.
De Witt T. Reiley, Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N. J.
William A. Reynolds, Wilmington, Del.
Leonard W. Richardson, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.
W. G. Richardson, Austin College, Sherman, Texas.
Ezekiel G. Robinson, Brown University, Providence, R. I.
Lawrence Rust, Kenyon College, Gambier, O.
Julius Sachs, Classical School, 649 Madison Ave., New York City.
George W. Samson, Rutgers Female College, New York City.
A. Duncan Savage, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
Wesley C. Sawyer, Lawrence University, Appleton, Wis.
Philip Schaff, Union Theological Seminary, New York City.
Henry Schliemann, Paris, France.
Jotham B. Sewall, Thayer Academy, Braintree, Mass.
Thomas D. Seymour, Western Reserve College, Hudson, O.
Joseph Alden Shaw, Highland Military Academy, Worcester, Mass.
L. A. Sherman, Hopkins Grammar School, New Haven, Conn.
Charles Short, Columbia College, New York City.
E. G. Sihler, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
Ephraim G. Squier, 135 East Thirty-ninth street, New York City.
A. B. Stark, Logan Female College, Russellville, Ky.
Benjamin F. Stem, Classical Institute, Easton, Pa.
Frederick Stengel, School of Mines, Columbia College, New York City.
William A. Stevens, Rochester Theological Seminary, Rochester, N. Y.
Edward F. Stewart, Easton, Pa.
Austin Stickney, Florence, Italy.
J. Henry Thayer, Andover Theological Seminary, Andover, Mass.

William E. Thompson, Genesee Wesleyan Seminary, Lima, N. Y.
Crawford H. Toy, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky.
J. Hammond Trumbull, Hartford, Conn.
Joseph A. Turner, Hollins Institute, Botetourt Springs, Va.
William S. Tyler, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.
Milton Valentine, Pennsylvania College, Gettysburg, Pa.
James C. Van Benschoten, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.
Addison Van Name, Yale College, New Haven, Conn.
C. Osborne Ward, 486 Adelphi street, Brooklyn, N. Y.
W. B. Webster, Military Institute, Norfolk, Va.
R. F. Weidner, Philadelphia, Pa.
James C. Welling, Columbian University, Washington, D. C.
J. B. Weston, Antioch College, Yellow Springs, O.
Mrs. A. E. Weston, Antioch College, Yellow Springs, O.
Albert S. Wheeler, Sheffield Scientific School, New Haven, Conn.
John Williams White, Harvard College, Cambridge, Mass.
W. H. Whitsitt, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Lexington, Ky.
William D. Whitney, Yale College, New Haven, Conn.
J. Colver Wightman (Life Member), Taunton, Mass.
Alonzo Williams, Brown University, Providence, R. I.
Edwin H. Wilson, Yale College, New Haven, Conn.

The Executive Committee herewith announce, in accordance with the votes of the members communicating with the Secretary [see p. 24], that the Eleventh Annual Session of the Association will be held at Newport, R. I., beginning Tuesday, July 15, 1879, at 3 o'clock P. M.

Members intending to read papers at the next session of the Association are requested to notify the Secretary at as early a date as possible.